

nitida, sublevi, transversim irregulariter interdum striata, strigis minutissimis longitudinalibus decussata, aperturam versus haud tumente; apertura paulo declivi, nec contracta, margine reflexo circumata; septo magno, mamillato, hemisphærico; interdum apice globuloso, vix perspicuo; margine laterali et dorsali in uno semicirculari; operculo . . . ?

Long. 0.0012 m.; diam. 0.00025 m.

Hab. Colon, Aspinwall.

2. CÆCUM BIMAMILLATUM (published in 'Les Fonds de la Mer').
Pl. VIII. figs. 6, 7.

Testa parva, cylindrica, tenui, diaphana, albida, sublevi, transversim minute striata, submalleata, aperturam versus haud tumente; apertura vix declivi, vix contracta; septo mamillato, valido; apice globuloso, dextro; margine laterali convexo; operculo . . . ?

Long. 0.0016 m.; diam. 0.0003 m.

Hab. La Guayra.

3. CÆCUM CARMENENSE (published in 'Les Fonds de la Mer').

Testa conica, paulo arcuata, subgracili, albida, levi, transversim minutissime striata, aperturam versus vix tumente, vel haud tumente; apertura contracta, paulo declivi, haud marginata; septo parvulo, unguolato; margine laterali subrecto; operculo . . . ?

Long. 0.0025 m.; diam. 0.00035-0.0006 m.

Hab. Lagunam de Terminos (*Carmen*).

4. CÆCUM ORIENTALE (published in 'Les Fonds de la Mer').

Testa parva, subconica, arcuata, satis robusta, albida, nitida, levi; apertura leviter declivi, vix contracta, haud marginata; septo prominente, mucronato; apice paulo rotundato, dextro; margine laterali vix concavo, dorsali subconvexo; operculo . . . ?

Long. 0.0015 m.; diam. 0.0003 m.

Hab. Mersina.

5. CÆCUM AURICULATUM (published in 'Les Fonds de la Mer').

Testa irregulariter elevata, interdum lata, cylindrica, subdiaphana, nitida, levi, aperturam versus annulo lato, subplanato, subrotundato, parum expresso cincta; apertura vix declivi, haud contracta, leviter marginata; septo magno, mamillato seu hemisphærico; apice unguolato vel auriculato, dextro; operculo . . . ?

Long. $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} 0.0023 \text{ m.} \\ 0.0019 \text{ m.} \end{array} \right.$; diam. $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} 0.0005 \text{ m.} \\ 0.0003 \text{ m.} \end{array} \right.$

Hab. Palermam.

6. CÆCUM STRIGOSUM (published in 'Les Fonds de la Mer'). Pl. VIII.
fig. 5.

Testa elongata, cylindrica, solida, albida vel cornea, transversim irregulariter striata, aperturam versus paulo tumente et sulcis paucis vix impressis notata; apertura paululum declivi et contracta, leviter

marginata; septo valde mamillato, magis hemisphærico; margine laterali cum dorsali in uno convexissimo; operculo . . . ?

Long. 0·002 m.; diam. 0·0004 m.

Hab. Rio Janeiro.

7. CÆCUM VESTITUM (published in 'Les Fonds de la Mer').

Testa (quoad genus) maxima, cylindrica, paulo arcuata, subdiaphana, levi, epidermide flavescente induta, minute striata; apertura declivi, contracta, annulo lato subplanato circumvoluta; septo mamillato; interdum apice minuto unguato, dextro; margine laterali et dorsali in uno haud circulari; operculo . . . ?

Long. 0·0035 m.; diam. 0·0008 m.

Hab. Lagunam de Terminos et Vera Cruz.

8. CÆCUM CIRCUMVOLUTUM (published in 'Les Fonds de la Mer').

Pl. VIII. fig. 3.

Testa subconica, arcuata, subcornea seu griseola, tenui, subdiaphana, sublevi, transversim minutissime striata, aperturam versus annulo lato valido rotundo circumvoluta; apertura paulo declivi, haud contracta, marginata; septo primum paulo mamillato, dein subungulato, submucronato; margine laterali fere recto, parum undulato; operculo . . . ?

Long. 0·0018 m.; diam. 0·0002-0·0004.

Hab. Colon, Aspinwall.

9. CÆCUM TORQUATUM (published in 'Les Fonds de la Mer'). Pl. VIII.

figs. 2, 3.

Testa subcylindrica, interdum valde angusta et elongata, diaphana vel opaca, nitida, primum transversim et minutissime striata, dein sublevigata, postea strigis validioribus cingulata, tumore prominente rotundato sulcato aperturam circueunte; apertura declivi, paulo contracta, marginata; septo submamillato cum apice latissimo, unguato, dextro; margine laterali convexo, dorsali concavo; operculo . . . ?

Long. $\begin{cases} 0\cdot0025 \text{ m.} \\ 0\cdot0018 \text{ m.} \end{cases}$; diam. $\begin{cases} 0\cdot0005 \text{ m.} \\ 0\cdot0003 \text{ m.} \end{cases}$, tumoris 0·0007 m.

Hab. ad insulam Guadalupam.

10. CÆCUM CUPCINA (published in 'Les Fonds de la Mer').

Testa cylindrica, elongata, arcuata, albida, nitida, subopaca, levi, transversim minute striata, aperturam versus profunde sulcata, dein expansa; apertura declivi, haud contracta, haud marginata; septo minimo, subungulato, submucronato; apice obtuso, dextro; margine laterali vix concavo; operculo . . . ?

Long. 0·0025 m.; diam. 0·0005 m.

Hab. Vera Cruz.

11. CÆCUM VERACRUZANUM (published in 'Les Fonds de la Mer').

Testa cylindrica, curta, lata, subdiaphana, nitida, levi, minute transversim striata, aperturam versus vix inflatula, dein contracta; aper-

tura declivi, haud marginata; septo parvo, ungulato; apice dextro; margine laterali primum convexo, dein concavo, dorsali concavo; operculo . . . ?

Long. 0·0015 m.; diam. 0·0006 m.

Hab. Vera Cruz.

The points of contact between the last of these species and a well-marked *Cæcum* will be readily seen. I will take one which is perhaps not the nearest approach to *C. veracruzianum*, but which at any rate resembles it very closely, and which has the most perfect claim to be placed under the genus *Cæcum*; this is *C. curtatum*; and we shall at once have established the relation which unites the solitary species of *Brochina* to the genus *Cæcum*. It consequently appears to me quite evident that no distinctive character remains of the genus *Brochina* beyond the convexity of the *operculum*; and if we recall what has been stated above with respect to shells not smooth being furnished with a convex operculum (I refer to those prematurely named by us *B. Someri* and *B. achirona*), it must be allowed that there is nothing to induce us to regard the genus as sufficiently established.

But my doubts have not been confined to the above genus alone; I have also suspicions respecting *Strebloceras* or *Phleboceras*. Several specimens of primary shells having been met with in the sands, they were subjected to a scrupulous examination. I speedily noticed amongst them some specimens in which part of the adolescent shell was already existing, upon which was plainly evident the annular ornamentation of certain species; it was evident that these specimens could only belong to the genus *Cæcum*. Close comparison of these young *Cæcum*s, and of other shells belonging to the first stage, afforded nothing which marked any want of resemblance; and consequently in my eyes all belonged to *Cæcum*. This observation gave rise to my doubts.

However, having received from M. Deshayes specimens of his fossil species *S. Edwardsii*, we noticed that the individuals of this species presented the appearance of a shell belonging to the *Cæcidæ*, in which the three stages continued united, with a slight deviation in the general plane. There was no contortion, as in *Meioceras*, but a slight inclination of the plane of the primary stage relatively to that of the second; and the second bore the same relation to the third. From this I conceived that I was justified in regarding the deviation as characteristic of the genus, and that this particular was apparent only in the complete shells,

such as were presented in the specimens of *S. Edwardsii*; my doubts were thus dissipated. Nevertheless a decisive circumstance shortly after occurred, which proved that my first opinion was the better founded. I received a specimen of the sea-bottom from the Bay of Colon, Aspinwall, and amongst a great number of shells I discovered some specimens of a variety of *C. lirato-cinctum*. Some of these were young, others adolescent or adult; but amongst them I found a beautiful specimen presenting the three stages of growth united in the same shell, and exhibiting the same deviation as that observed in *S. Edwardsii*, a deviation equally marked in some specimens in which the primary and second stages only were united. The establishment of such a fact evidently shows that the species referred to *Strebloceras* or *Phleboceras* merely represent fortuitous instances of the persistence of the shell of the primary stage upon that of the second, and sometimes even upon that of the third, the first and second remaining united to one another as well as to the third.

Descriptions of a New Genus and Six New Species of Spiders.

By the Rev. O. P. CAMBRIDGE. Communicated by JAMES SALTER, Esq., F.R.S., F.L.S.

(PLATE IX.)

[Read June 18, 1868.]

Introduction.—It will be long, probably, before the study of Arachnology becomes as popular as that of some other classes of the “Articulata.”

Spiders and their allies have neither the intrinsic beauty of the “Coleoptera” to attract the collector, nor the varied habits and transformations of the “Lepidoptera” to commend them to the incipient student of Entomology; hence, perhaps, in great measure, it is that the *systematic* students of Arachnology in Europe at the present time may be more than numbered on one’s fingers’ ends, while Coleopterists and Lepidopterists are “legion.”

There are difficulties also in studying the habits of Spiders, which do not exist in respect to the Lepidoptera generally. The habits of these latter are commonly to be observed by day, whereas the majority of the Arachnida are nocturnal; and then, again, I think it is true that the habits of the *rapacious classes of*

